

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application in light of the amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Status of the Claims

Claims 1-14 are pending. Claims 1-4, 6-8, 10-11 and 13 have been amended. Claim 14 is added. No new matter has been added.

Applicants submit that the amendments to claims 2-4, 6-8 and 10-11 are minor in nature made to place the claims in better conformance with idiomatic English without narrowing the scope of these claims, and were not made for reasons of patentability.

The Examiner has objected to claims 1 and 13 for containing the phrase “galvanically isolated,” and has ignored this phrase so as to examine claims 1 and 13. A person of ordinary skill in the art of antennas would understand that the phrase “galvanically isolated” has the plain meaning of being electrically insulated. Thus, as used in claims 1 and 13, the radiating element is electrically insulated from other conductive parts. Applicants respectfully submit that an amendment to the Specification is not necessary. However, such an amendment would be supported by the recital of claims 1 and 13 as filed, for the reasons explained above, and would not constitute new matter.

The Examiner has objected to claim 7, and contends the term “extrusion piece” recited therein is not explained in the Specification. Applicants call the Examiner’s attention to Specification, page 5, lines 33-35, where it is described that “the upper portion 640 of the rear part of the cover of the radio device is made of a conductive material and serves as a radiating element. It is made of aluminum, for example by extruding.” Claim 7 depends from claim 6, and

the feed element . . . to antenna port and ground plane.” Applicant submits that Tarvas ‘652 does not disclose a feed circuit, but a feed conductor. A person of ordinary skill in the antenna art would recognize that the feed conductor disclosed by Tarvas ‘652 is not a feed conductor. Tarvas ‘652 discloses the radiating element is galvanically connected to the radio device ground through the ground contact (*see* Fig. 8, item 804; Fig. 10, item 1004; etc.). Finally, as mentioned above Tarvas ‘652 merely discloses a feed conductor and not a feed circuit. Further, what the Examiner contends is a “feed circuit” does not connect the antenna feed point to the ground plane. The antenna feed point is connected only to the antenna port in Tarvas ‘652.

The Examiner acknowledges that Tarvas ‘652 does not disclose a reactive feed. The Examiner cites McNamara as disclosing a reactive feed, and states that it would have been obvious for a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Tarvas ‘652 with McNamara to achieve the present claims.

McNamara discloses a tuning circuit of a dual band antenna that is digitally switchable to different frequency bands by changes in reactive circuit elements (Fig. 1, items 4, 5.) Applicant submits that the tuning circuit of McNamara is not a feed circuit. The circuit is merely connected to the feed conductor, but it is not located in the feed path. In contrast, the feed circuit of the present claims is in the feed path. Therefore, a person of ordinary skill in the art would not know from McNamara to reconfigure its tuning circuit into a feed circuit and combine it into a feed path of Tarvas ‘652 to achieve the claimed invention. Thus, the combination of Tarvas ‘652 and McNamara does not result in the claimed invention.

Applicant submits that neither Kaiponen or Tarvas ‘989 disclose or suggest those features not disclosed and suggested by Tarvas ‘652 and McNamara as noted above. Thus, both the combination of Tarvas ‘652, McNamara, and Kaiponen, and the combination of Tarvas ‘652,

McNamara, and Tarvas '989 do not disclose nor suggest the claimed invention. Accordingly, the Examiner has failed to meet the burden of establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness over the claims. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections is requested.

CONCLUSION

Each and every point raised in the Office Action dated May 4, 2005 has been addressed on the basis of the above amendments and remarks. In view of the foregoing it is believed that claims 1-14 are in condition for allowance and it is respectfully requested that the application be reconsidered and that all pending claims be allowed and the case passed to issue.

If there are any other issues remaining which the Examiner believes could be resolved through a Supplemental Response or an Examiner's Amendment, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: August 4, 2005


Richard J. Katz
Reg. No. 47,698
Attorney for Applicants

DARBY & DARBY, . P.C.
Post Office Box 5257
New York, N.Y. 10150-5257
Phone: (212) 527-7700

ATTACHMENT

Amendments to the Drawings

The replacement drawing sheet, which is presented in **Attachment A**, includes changes to Figures 6(a) and 6(b). Specifically, changes were made to depict parasitic element 650. No new matter is added. This replacement sheet, which includes Figures 5, 6(a) and 6(b) replaces the previous sheet which also included Figures 5, 6(a) and 6(b).

Attachment A: Replacement Drawing Sheet